A Sober

ANSVVER

To a Scandalous Paper termed

Three Queries

And Answers to them.

Privately spread abroad to amuse the *People*, and disaffect them to the *King*, and his late

Christian Declaration

FOR

Liberty of Conscience,

By calling in question the Legallity of it.

With Allowance.

London, Printed and Sold by *Andrew Sowle*, at the *Three Keys*, in *Nags-Head-Court*, in *Grace-Church-Street*, over-against the Conduit, 1688.

Harvard College Library
Peabody Fund
March 25, 1932

7772
34

A Sober ANSVVER TO A Scandalous Paper, &c.

AMong the many prudent Admonitions of *King Solomon*, I find theſe, *Prov.* 17. 26, 27. *To Puniſh the Juſt is not good, nor to Strike Princes for Equity: He that hath Knowledge ſpareth his Words, and a Man of Underſtanding is of an excellent Spirit*; or as the Margent hath it, *a ſoft Spirit*. Surely if this Advice had been taken, the Author of this Paper would never have ſo highly taxed the *King* for doing an Act wherein he hath ſhewed ſo much Prudence and Chriſtianity as his *Declaration* demonſtrates; for by it he hath hurt none, but hath prevented the hurting of many, and that this ſhould ſtir up any to inveigh ſo bitterly againſt him, is a matter greatly to be admired and lamented by all Sober and Moderate Men.

The firſt Query is,

whether the matter of the late Declaration be Illegal.

The firſt Anſwer,

It is altogether Illegal, the reaſon given is, the Foot upon which the Declaration *ſtands, is not only a Diſpenſing Power in particular Caſes, but a Diſannulling Power, and highly prejudical to the* King *himſelf, becauſe it takes away the Faith and Truſt which his People repoſe in Him, when a Law is made which they look upon as their Security.*

Reply,

Reply, The *Query* being put in general tearms, and the *Answer* like it, it may be reasonably apprehended the Author judgeth it contrary to the *Law of God* and the *Nation*; that *Liberty of Conscience* is not contrary to the *Law of God*, is very evident by the Scriptures, which hath been proved very largly in many publick Prints on this occasion, enough to satisfie any unprejudiced Enquirer. And to take Law in the right sence, it cannot be against the *Law of the Nation*, for it is an approved Maxime, **Salus Populi est suprema Lex**, *The Safety of the People is the Supream Law*; especially when the *King* who best understands wherein the Safety of the People lys judgeth so.

And do not the *Lawyers* acknowledge, that the *Law of God* is written in the Heart? and that every Mans Law must be consonant with the *Law of God*, and therefore the *Laws of Princes*, the *Commandments of Prelates*, the *Statutes of Communalities*, nor yet the *Ordinances of the Church* are not Righteous nor Obligatory, but as they are consonant to the *Law of God*, against which Law Prescription, nor Custom may not prevail; and if any be brought in against it, they be not Prescriptions, Statutes, nor Customs, but things void, and against Justice; and are not Laws for illegal Ruining and Destroying People for their Conscientious Worshipping of *God* such? for Legallity and Illegallity doth not depend upon Laws made by a particular Faction, for the Ruining all that are not of their Stamp, but that is truly Legallity which hath a regard to the general good of all, and distributes equal right unto all Men without Partiallity, which is the matter and end of the *Declaration*, so that it is a most malicious Insinuation to say, *The* King *thereby takes away that Faith and Trust which the People repose in Him.* And in regard the *King* refers the abrogating of those destructive Laws to the meeting of a *Parliament*, the Power he useth is not a disannulling, but a Power to prevent Mischief.

For Experience shews nothing more common among careful Men, who have Herds and Flocks, then if any of them are given to Butt and Gore the rest, that they either cut their Horns, or clog them, to prevent their doing Mischief: And are not Dogs often Musled to prevent their Bitting People? And may not a better Argument be maintained against the preventing the Mischief these Creatures may do, seeing they are deprived of the use of what Nature

Nature affords them? but these Laws for Ruining People are meer contrivances for that purpose and intent.

So that the *King* coming to his Crown, seeing what Ruining and Destroying there was of People for their Consciences, having a due regard to the good of his People in general, hath interposed his Power to prevent the like for the future; and pray herein what good Law hath he broken? and wherein hath he deceived the People, or failed them in the Trust reposed in him?

And seeing the *Kings* Dispencing Power is so much inveighed against, which is only a forbearing the Execution of some *Penal Laws*, which ruined the Industrous part of the Nation; Why hath there not been as much Zeal shewn against the *Justices of Peace* for these many Years in not strictly prosecuting the *Penal Laws* against *Cursing*, *Swearing*, *Drunkenness* and *Whoring*, which they are sworn to Execute? or should the Justices of Peace have a Power to suspend the Punishment of Evil, but the *King* being more streightly tyed, that he shall not have power to dispence with the Penalties provided against tender Consciences? Doth not this plainly shew, that the *King* cannot please some, except he suffer them to destroy others? and that their Zeal is not for the right use of Law, but for the abuse of it, to gratifie their envious Minds. But if things are well considered the *King* hath a better Foot for his *Declaration* then this Author would allign him. It cannot be forgotten, that the late *King*, to quiet the Minds of all his Subjects, in his *Declaration* from *Breda* saith thus,

We do declare a Liberty to tender Consciences, and that no Man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of Religion, which do not disturb the Peace; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament as upon mature deliberation shall be offered to us, for the full granting of that Indulgence.

But none being offered to him, and the *King* being not forgetful of his Promise in 1662. he put forth another *Declaration*, wherein he repeated his Promise in his former, and further saith thus, *We remember well the confirmations we have made of them since upon several occasions in Parliament, and all these things are still fresh in our Memory, so are we still firm in the resolution of performing them to the full.*

And in 1672. he gave forth another *Declaration*, in the Preamble of which he useth many substantial Arguments inducing him

to

to it, he thus expreſſeth himſelf, *We do in the next place declare, our Will and Pleaſure to be that the Execution of all and all manner of* Penal Laws *in matters Eccleſiaſtical againſt whatſoever ſort of* Nonconformiſts, *or* Recuſants *be immediately ſuſpended, and they are hereby ſuſpended*, &c.

All theſe foregoing *Declarations* Plainly ſhew, that the *King* would have granted a general Liberty, had he met with a *Parliament* that would have joyned with him; but His and the Nations unhappineſs was, that the *Parliament* inſtead of centering with him in ſo good a Work, put him upon enacting Laws quite of another nature, ſo that the *King* was drawn from the conſcientious performance of his promiſe at *Breda*, to a vehement Proſecution of thoſe he had promiſed Liberty to.

For in the time of the *Sickneſs*, the Priſons being infected, were crowded full of *Conſcientious Diſſenters*, whereby many were made Widows and Fatherleſs, and many Families Ruined, and theſe Proſecutions continued to the end of the *Kings* Reign, who by his *Declarations* cleared himſelf from the Blood and Spoyl that was made thereby, and ſo it lies at the Doors of them who were the promoters of it, for which they muſt give an account to the Righteous Judge of Heaven and Earth.

The preſent *King* ſeeing how his Brother was diſappointed of his good intentions, and fore-ſeeing the Ruin that was coming upon the Nation, through the violent proceedings that were on Foot, might very well think a conſcientious Obligation lay on the Crown for the performance of that which his Brother had promiſed, gave forth his Gracious *Declaration*, whereby he delivered the Oppreſſed, and ſtopt the Violence of the Oppreſſors; which makes them as much out of Order as *Diana's Silver-Smiths* were when the Apoſtle *Paul* came to *Epheſus*, ſo that they ſpared not to throw Dirt in the face of the *King*, and ſay His *Declaration is Illegal*; and yet in another place to Excuſe the Clergy, for not publiſhing it, ſay, *The King can do no Illegal thing*; whereby the whole deſign of the Paper is made void. For if the *Declaration* be the *Kings*, and he own it as his Act, as without doubt he will, then it is confeſſed to be Legal, and the Clergy are no wayes excuſable in not reading of it, being commanded by the *King*, and permitted by their own *Liturgy*.

But the queſtion may be put, whether a good Chriſtian would make

make a greater ſcruple, of reading the *Book of Sports*, or the *Order of Seſſions for Proſecuting Diſſenters*, or the *Kings Declaration for Liberty of Conſciance*? Surely this is not unlike ſtraining at a *Gnat*, and ſwallowing a *Camel*.

Upon the ſecond Reaſon I query; if each *Biſhop* or *Miniſter* is not a capable Judg in ſuch Caſes, but are Judges of their own Conſciences; why did they not urge that for their Reaſon, which no doubt would have better pleaſed the *King*, then the Reaſons they gave; but in regard they looked upon themſelves to be Computent Judges, they undertook to diſpute the *Kings* diſpencing power; ſuch Diſputations and Actions would not have been allowed in *King Henry* the Eight's time, who brought all the *Clergy* in *England* under a Premunire, for tranſgreſſing his *Proclamation*, wherein he did forbid the divulging or publiſhing any thing heretofore within this Year, paſſed, purchaſed, or to be purchaſed hereafter, containing matter prejudicial to the high Authority, Juriſdiction, and Prorogative Royal of this his ſaid Realm, or to the Let, Hinderance or Impeachment of his Graces noble and intended Purpoſes in the Premiſes, upon pain of incuring his Highneſſes Indignation and Impriſonment, and further Puniſhment of their Bodies for their ſo doing, at his Graces Pleaſure, to the dreadful Example of all other, as the Words of the *Proclamation* are.

The occaſion of this *Proclamation* was; the *King* was minded to put away his Brother Prince *Arthurs* Wife, whom he had Married, wherein he was oppoſed by the *Church of Rome*, but the *Clergy of England* ſupporting and maintaining the Legantine Power of the *Cardinal* in oppoſition to the *King*, by reaſon thereof, were all entangled in a premunire, which coſt them a Contribution of 118840 *l.* 10 *d.* with which Sum of Money, much Labour, and their humble ſubmiſſion (in which they called the *King the Supream Head of the Church of England*) obtained their Pardon, and yet at that time, or not long before, the *King* was no Enemy to the *Pope*, but ſought all means to eſtabliſh the *See of Rome*, as may be ſeen in the Book of *Martyrs*, Fol. 959. the old Impreſſion.

If *King Henry* the Eight was ſo ſevere with the *Clergy* of his own Religion, for their only doing that he commanded them they

ſhould

should not do, and that only in opposition to them that went about to hinder the putting away his Wife, with whom he had lived with near Twenty Years: How much more are they to blame, who transgress the *Kings* command in a matter which so meerly concerns the good of the Nation? Surely our *King* hath as much power to command as He to forbid, and the cause in hand is much more lawful then that he promoted: And though they have so lightly come off for this their contempt against the *King*, yet those who have been found in contempt against the *Bishops Courts* have found more Severe dealing, for first they are Excommunicated, then upon the Writ *de Excommunicato Capiendo*, Imprisoned during Life, except they Conform and be Absolved; which hath cost many long Imprisonments, and their Lives at last, so that it is much better to fall into the Hand of a merciful *King*, then an unmerciful *Bishop*. For the *King* for a high contempt, is willing to take their own Recognizance for their appearance to answer the Law, and for refusing thereof sends them to a Prison fit for Men, gives them a fair Tryal at Law by a Jury of their own Church-Men, and their Council Liberty to plead what they can for them. But for contempt against the *Bishops*, thongh many times Ignorant ones, for want of the knowledge of the methods of their Courts, and sometimes real conscientious ones, Men and Women are Excommunicated, and cast into noisome Goals, fitter for Dogs and Swine then Men and Women, where many have lain till Death, which hath been little taken notice of. But what a clutter hath there been about a few Dayes Imprisonment of Seven *Bishops*, only for a wilful refusal of giving Recognizance to appear at the *King-Bench-Bar* in order to a fair Tryal. Surely that *Bishop* was in a terrible fright, who Preaching a Sermon after he was sent for up, no Text would serve him, but, *Father if it be thy Will let this Cup pass from me*; intimating that he expected to meet with very great Suffering, or as if he was very unable to bear what he expected; else he would never have so abused the Words of our *Saviour*.

But this Carriage of the *Bishops* brings to my mind an old proverb of their own, *No Bishop, No King*, intimating that without the *Bishops* the *King* could not long continue, but their Behaviour in this late matter doth bespeak, that except the *King* will do only

what

what they will have him, and admit them for his Superiors, they will divest him of his Prerogative, and then no *King*, but in subjection to the *Bishops*; if this be the Legal Loyalty spoken of, I suppose the *King* will hardly take it so, but rather as tending to *Crimen læsæ Majestatis*.

And I would willingly know whether it is only *Bishops* and *Ministers* that are Judges of their own private Consciences, and against which they must not go? or it is a privilege that belongs to all Christians in general; if it is answered in the affirmative as of necessity it must, it according to truth, for *Rom.* 14. 5. the Apostle saith, *Let every one be fully perswaded in his own mind*, and if in such small matters, much more in matters that concerns Life and Salvation; then the *Kings Declaration* cannot be abusively termed Illegal, the end and intent of it being to leave every Man to be judg of his own Conscience, and to worship *God* as he is perswaded he ought to do; herein this Author hath done like the rest of his Brethren, for it is a common Practice with them, when they are put to it, to make use of their Opponents Arguments to defend their own Cause; and allow that for a good Plea to themselves, which they denied to others when used to more purpose: Surely he intended none but Fools and Ideots should read his Paper, and not considerate Men, for they would soon find out his Nonsence and Contradictions.

For if it be allowed that every Man is judg of his own private Conscience, against which he must not go; then how ill have the *Church of England* done above these Twenty Years, in Persecuting People for keeping to it? And how well hath the *King* done to stop the violence thereof, he hath done like a true Father of his Country, and no doubt *God* will own, and stand by him in it against all opposition.

Thirdly, he saith, *This case is publickly adjudged against in Parliament* 1672.

Query, **Whether the Judgment of a Dissolved Parliament, or a Reigning King, with the approbation of the Judges be most authentick**, but some have been adjudged by Parliament to be *Protestant Dissenters*, and yet have been Prosecuted as *Popish Recusants*.

Secondly, He ſaith, *The generall forbearance of Addreſſes, grounded upon the illegallity of that diſpencing Power, ſhews this to have been the judgment of the greateſt part of the* Clergy, *and others.*

Reply, If each *Biſhop* and *Miniſter* is not capable to judge in ſuch caſes, then what ſignifies their Judgment in forbearing of Addreſſes, but Ingratitude in the higheſt Nature? for no People but the *Church of England*, who had received ſuch gracious Promiſes from a *Prince* of a different Perſwalion, but would have thought themſelves Obliged, to have made a grateful acknowledgment for them.

And as to the *Declaration* of the *Judges*, he ſeems to undervalue it, becauſe it never yet came legally to the knowledge of the Subjects.

Reply, It is a ſign the *King* was not minded to do any thing that is illegal, for he not only took the advice of his *wiſe Council*, but alſo of the Judges, who ſit in the *Houſe of Lords* to be adviſed with in difficult Caſes of Law; for if they are judged capable of adviſing the Law-makers, ſurely the *King* hath fully ſhewed his clearneſs in taking their advice; for they are as Capable to adviſe Him in matters of Law, as they would have been the *Houſe of Lords*, if they were now ſitting; if the Judgment of the *Judges* had been for the Authors purpoſe, he would not have cavelled at it as he doth.

His fourth Reaſon is, *The* Biſhops *refuſing to ſend the Order and Declaration, the* Miniſters *have ſomething more then their own private Judgments to move them to refuſe to read it.*

Reply, What help is this to them, when they are not capable Judges in ſuch caſes.

The Second Query with its anſwer and reaſons depending upon the legallity or illegallity of the *Declaration* is already anſwered by proving it illegal, that I need ſay little to it, for it is the *Kings* Act, and he ſaith, *The King can do no illegal thing.*

The Third Query.

What are the ill Conſequences of reading the Declaration?

Anſwer, *They are many and great, and therefore in Prudence as well as Conſcience, it ought not to be done*, and draws up the ill Conſequences under five Heads.

Firſt,

Firſt, *The* Clergy *will be judged Cowards and Hypocrites.*

Secondly, *He fears many who have Votes in chooſing Parliament Men, will be ſtrengthened in chooſing not only Friends to the Indulgence, but Diſpenſing Power.*

Thirdly, *He apprehends the reading of it, was only ordered to make them parties to it, it being ſo well known already.*

Fourthly, *He fears an advantage will be taken by their reading it, and it will be publiſhed in the* Gazette, &c.

Fifthly, *That after they have read it, they may expect other things may be ordered to be publiſhed by them, at which they making a ſtand when they have loſt their Reputation, will be of no force, and the danger he propoſeth, is looſing their intereſt in the* Penal Laws *and Teſts.*

Reply, Theſe are inconſiderable Inconveniences in compariſon of what would attend them for their Diſobedience, if the *King* ſhould be ſevere; for as the wiſe *King Solomon* ſaith, *The Wrath of the* King *is as a Meſſenger of Death, but a wiſe Man will paciſie it.* And again, *The* King's *Wrath is as the Roaring of a Lion, but his Favour is as the Dew upon the Graſs:* Therefore be adviſed and lay aſide your high Provocations againſt the *King*, leaſt his Patience and Gentleneſs be turned into Wrath, and ye repent when it is too late.

Objections in General,

It may be Objected, **There will be great Inconveniences on the other ſide.** To which he Anſwers,

If any thing be Illegal, both in Matter and Publication, we are not to do it for fear of Inconveniences, but perform our Duty, and to leave the event to God, a certain Evil muſt not be done to avoid a Contingent one.

Reply, The Legallity of the matter is already proved, and the Publication of it is hindred by the ſtubbornneſs of the *Clergy*; ſo that you have juſt cauſe to fear the contingent Inconveniences, ſeeing you are contending againſt your *King*, and how can you expect a good event from *God* in ſo bad a Work.

Objections in Particular.

It may be Objected, first, *This will be interpreted by the* Papists, *as a failure of our great Principles and Loyalty.*

To which I answer *Yes*, and all sober Men besides; for you not acknowledging so large a Favour as the *King* hath bestowed on you, affects you both with Disloyalty and Ingratitude; for it is acknowledged the *Clergy* refused to Address even in a branch that made for themselves, because it proceeded from the Dispencing Power, which is an absolute stubborn piece of Disloyalty, and appropriating a legal sort of Loyalty to your selves, because you oppose the *King* in dispencing with the Ruining *Penal Laws*, will not make you the better Subjects, but shews what you would be at; and because you cannot still be perplexing your Neighbours with those cruel Laws; you would make People believe that all Law is taken away, and you are the Men that only stand up to hinder it, but do not shew the obstruction of any good Law to the prejudice of the meanest Subject: And this course you take doth not maintain the Principle of Suffering without an Antichristian opposition, for then you would have taken *Christ* for your Example, *Who when he was Reviled, Reviled not again; when he Suffered, he Threatened not, but committeth himself to him that judgeth righteously*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 23. But because the *King* will not let you Ruin and Destroy People, as you have done for many Years, you revile him, and care not what Dirt you throw in his Face.

The Second Objection,

That Dissenters *may construe this refusal a Declaration against all Tenderness to them.*

Answer, Which very well they may, and no assurances from your *Church-Men* of their inclination to Tenderness to them will perswade them to the contrary, for they continued Spoyling and Destroying as long as they durst, and some having attempted it since the coming forth of the *Kings Declaration*, plainly shews it; and they look upon this refusal to be on purpose to hinder Favours towards them; for the Indulgence or Dispencing Power doth

hurt

hurt to no body, but administers a great deal of Comfort and Liberty to the *Dissenters*; for now they are not forced to come to your Church against their Consciences, but have Liberty to serve *God* as they are fully perswaded in their own Minds, without being Ruined for their so doing.

But as you have invaded the Prerogative of *God*, his Rule in the Conscience, so you would deprive the *King* of his Prerogative, in saving his People from Ruin; and none among the *Dissenters* are so foolish, who are in their right Wits, as to take this not to proceed from disaffection to them, but a Testimony of your Sincerity for the *Protestant Religion*, which if you were not wilfully Blind you might easily see.

The Third Objection,

That Suspension or Deprivation of the Refusers may follow, whereby the People of our Church may be left as Sheep without a Shepherd.

To which he answers, first, *Our Church, &c. will suffer less by the Conscientiousness of their suspended Ministers, then it will do by their illegal complyance in so great and fundamental a Point.*

Secondly, *God will provide for them, being his own Cause for which they suffer.*

Which it will be a hard matter to prove, but after all, the *Kings* Clemency is that they most depend on, but would do well to consider how ill they have treated him for his tendered Clemency, so that in Justice he might wholly with-draw it from you, and look upon you of Quondam Friends to be his present Enemies.

How do you think *King Henry* the Eighth would have taken such dealings from his Subjects? he would soon have made the *Clergy* understand better. And if you had lived in his Days, and suffered as much as many then did, and the *King* had by vertue of his Prerogative dispenced with the *Penal Laws* by which you Suffered, would you have exclaimed against his Dispencing Power for so doing, or rather blest *God* for putting it into the *Kings* Heart to take Compassion of you, as many do now?

And though you take so much pains to malign the *King* for his Zeal and Resolution in this Glorious Work, yet I do not doub

ba

but it will make him more Renowned then any of his Progenitors, ſo that Ages and Generations to come will Bleſs God on his behalf.

And in ſhort, to ſum up the whole drift of this Paper, which is,

Firſt, *To charge the* King *and his* Declaration *with Illegality.*

Secondly, *To excuſe the* Clergy *in their Diſobedience.*

Thirdly, *To excuſe themſelves both to* Papiſt *and* Proteſtant Diſſenters, *and to caſt a Jealouſie into their Minds, that if* Liberty of Conſcience *ſhould be Eſtabliſhed by a new* Magna Charta, *a new* Declaration *may put it aſide.* Which cannot be if the *Kings* Example be followed. For he hath taken all the legal Courſes that may be in the preſent Juncture, and defers the Diſanulling of them till a *Parliament* meets; and intends in order thereunto to call a *Parliament.*

But as to the *Magna Charta* already granted, the *King* hath not been taxed with the infringing or breaking it in the leaſt; for it doth not appear by all that hath or can be ſaid, that the *King* hath denied, deferred or ſold Juſtice to any Man, neither hath he taken, impriſoned or diſſeiſed any Man of his Free-hold, Liberties and Cuſtoms, but by the Judgment of his Peers.

But the *Church of England*, and their *Church-Men*, have made Laws to diſſeiſe Men of their Free-holds, Liberties and Cuſtoms, without the Judgment of their Peers, or ſaving to every Man his Contenement, the Merchant his Merchandiſe, and the Villaine his Wanage; for by the Oaths of two infamous Informers, a Man for only being at a Religious Meeting, was liable to be Fined from Five Shillings a time to Forty pound, without tryal of his Peers, and without ſaving unto him his Contenement or Merchandiſe, many times taking away from his Wife and Children, the Beds they lay on, the Pots they dreſt their Victuals in, and all things needful and neceſſary for their Subſiſtance, and when Informers have been impeached of Perjury, ſome Juſtices have been ſo kind as to excuſe them with being miſtaken.

Such as this are the Laws, and ſuch the execution of them, which the *King* hath deſpenced with, and for which many are ſo much concerned, that they would make People believe all Law and Equity is going to Ruin, becauſe they cannot ſtill be ruining their peaceable Neighbours.

So that thoſe who have broken the old *Magna Charta*, liable to the

the Curses denounced by the Makers of it, are the only Persons to be suspected, would break a new one if they could tell how; but I hope other Provision will be made.

And whereas the Author in the close of the Paper would entitle them to a dependancy on God, and his owning their Cause, I shall bring a few instances of many which might be produced, of very eminent Persons of their own communion, which may convince them to the contrary.

First, I hope none of the Church of England will deny that *King Charles* the First was a good *Protestant*, who thus said,

I have often declared, how little I desire my Laws and Scepter should intrench upon Gods Soveraignty, who is the only King of Mens Consciences.

Secondly, I may also suppose, that *King Charles* the Second was not questioned to be a *Protestant*, by reason of the Law made in his time against saying he was a *Papist*, who plainly shewed he was of his Fathers mind, as he manifested by the three Declarations he gave forth.

Thirdly, Dr *Taylor* an *Irish Bishop*, and without doubt a *Protestant*, writes thus; *Why are we so Zealous against those we call* Hereticks, *and yet great Friends with* Drunkards, and Swearers, and Fornicators, *and* Intemporate *and* Idle Persons; *I am certain a* Drunkard *is as contrary to God, and lives as contrary to* Christianity *as a* Heretick; *and I am also sure, that I know what Drunkenness is, but I am not sure that such an opinion is Heresie*, &c.

Fourthly, The Bishop of *Hereford* in his late print plainly disowns the refusal of the *Clergy* to read the *Kings Declaration*, avowing it to be contrary to the *Word of God*, refuting the Arguments and Reasons to the Contrary; but I am afraid too many professing Christianity stand up more for Intereſt then for Religion; for sometimes, *Submit your selves to every Ordinance of man*, is good Doctrin, though he ordains things to which People cannot submit for Conscience sake; but if it thwart their Intereſt though it doth not intrench upon their Consciences, then this Doctrine is to be wholy laid aside, and not at all regarded, so that by this rule all that may be called Religious, is made like a Nose of Wax to be formed into what shape they please. So that the *King*, in taking the advise

of

of his Father, and performing the Promise of his Brother, and therein being justified by the Testimonies of many approved Men, hath done more like a Christian then some would have him; shewing that a *Roman Catholick King* may be of better Principles, then those that pretend so much to Reformation.

What I have here written I hope will satisfie all Moderate Men, who are willing to do as they would be done by; but as for those who are willing to be deceived, I cannot help it if they be deceived, though I should be more glad of the Contrary.

FINIS.